

a matter of fact, I may tell you, almost all these points are found in the rules which guide the authorities in disposing of *poramboke* cases. For instance, length of possession, age of a building which stands on the encroachment, the fact whether it is useful or absolutely necessary for public purposes, all these are matters which are taken into consideration before any eviction is ordered. Government note the points that you have stated.

MEMBER: The Municipality is prepared to make a contribution. In the interest of the Government and the Revenue Department the work is necessary.

DEWAN: Government will see to its interests as also to the interests of the Revenue Department. As I said, the point is that it is not a work which can be taken up piecemeal; it has to await a general resurvey which the Government will order when other circumstances necessitate the same.

5. Kandukrishi.

MR. KRISHNA PANIKKAR SANKARA PANIKKAR (*Ambalapuzha taluk, Group I*) said that there was a total extent of 15,389.75 acres of *Kandukrishi* lands in the State, the greater portion of the lands being in Kuttanad. In comparison with other kinds of land, *Kandukrishi* lands were subjected to a disproportionately higher rate of taxation. It was high time to put an end to the excessive taxation. In such matters, a Travancorean Dewan was in a better position to understand the difficulties of the ryots. The hardships of the owners of *Kandukrishi* lands had been described at length in the memorials submitted to Government and in an Address presented to Her Highness the Maha Rani Regent. The grievances should be redressed.

In regard to *Kandukrishi* lands, the rate of 24 chackrams per *para* was fixed in 1102, on the average of the previous quinquennium. Those were years of exceptionally high prices. But since then the price of paddy had steadily declined; but the next revision of rates would take place only in 1108. In the meantime, the prevailing rate would weigh heavily upon the holders of *Kandukrishi* lands who were mostly poor men. The member therefore suggested that tax might be realised at the rate of 11 chackrams per *para*, as in the case of *pattom* lands.

DEWAN'S REPLY: Mr. Sankara Panikkar. On one point alone that you have raised I should say a word or two. You said that, by a comparison of the tax that is usually, on the average, levied on *pandara-pattom* lands with the tax that is levied on *Kandukrishi* lands, you could establish that *Kandukrishi* lands are heavily taxed. I should just say, on that point, that the comparison is not a reasonable one because of the fundamental difference in tenure between the two classes of lands. What in the one case is land tax is in the other case rent payable by the tenant to the landlord.

To the second point that you have raised, namely, the hardships that the *Kandukrishi* tenants are suffering from, Government will give their earnest attention, and the memorials sent to Government will be considered.

6. Disposal of land.

MR. PARIATHU PAKIRDEEN (*Todupuzha taluk*) said that the Tahsildars were responsible for considerable irregularity in the disposal of *puduvai* and *poramboke* lands. He could cite specific instances from the Todupuzha taluk. The following instances were in point:—

(i) The grant of lands in Survey No. 165/1 of the Karimannoor *pakuthi* to Mr. C. R. Kesava Pillai, Medical Officer, Todupuzha,

(ii) the grant of several acres of land by the Todupuzha Tahsildar, Mr. Kesava Pillai, to Krishna Pillai of Mavelikara, a hotel keeper at Todupuzha, and

(iii) the grant of 11 cents of *poramboke* land in Survey No. 193/7 adjoining the Todupuzha market to a compounder.

The land in item (ii) above passed within a short period of time into the hands of Vakil Mr. Kesava Pillai of Mavelikara, a friend of the Tahsildar. The land fetched only Rs. 40 per acre, while the lands in the neighbourhood were sold at the rate of Rs. 150 to Rs. 200 per acre in open auction. From the sale of timber from the aforesaid land Mr. Kesava Pillai got Rs. 3,000.

The land referred to in item (iii) above was given gratis to the compounder on the recommendation of the Tahsildar. It formed the subject of personal investigation by the Officiating Dewan.

The disposal of *puduvai* and *poramboke* lands in 1104 and 1105 by the Todupuzha Tahsildar was entirely irregular. The member prayed for a regular enquiry into the matter.

DEWAN'S REPLY: Mr. Pariathu Pakirdeen. One thing in general—I would say in regard to representations in this House. What I would suggest is something which I request all members to kindly remember. When you take up one or two particular instances—minor instances—in a particular locality or taluk and make that a subject of elaborate representation before an Assembly like this, it has to be considered and very seriously considered by you all whether it is not a waste of time. I would also suggest that, in making serious allegations of personal dishonesty against responsible officers, members have a duty which they owe to themselves as well as to the public, to make quite sure that such statements are true, before they give expression to them in an Assembly like this. Merely to say “I heard it said” or “I read it in some newspaper and therefore I am going to make a declaration that what is stated there is true”, it seems to me, is a very light way of taking one's duties as a member of an august assembly like this. I am sure that members will be at one with me that such representations, instead of serving any useful purpose, will